

Appl. No. 09/657,956
Filed 9/8/2000

Atty Docket JP920000170US1

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 16 2004

In re the application of: Prpic)
)
 Filed: September 8, 2000) Group Art Unit: 2154
)
 For: Accreditation of) Examiner: Chad Zhong
 Personnel)
)
 Appl. No.: 09/657,956)
)
 Applicant's Docket:)
 JP920000170US1)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Dear Sir:

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The assignee, International Business Machines Corporation, is the real party in interest.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

This is the first appeal in the present patent application. There are no other appeals or interferences known to the appellant or its legal representative. International Business Machines Corporation is the sole assignee of the patent application.

Appl. No. 09/657,956
Filed 9/8/2000

Atty Docket JP920000170US1

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1 through 10 are pending in the application. All 10 claims stand finally rejected and are the subject of this appeal.

Claims 1 through 8 were originally presented in the application. In response to a first Office action dated December 19, 2003, (the "First Office Action"), which rejected all claims on the ground of prior art, Appellant filed a reply on March 19, 2004, ("Reply A") amending all claims and adding new, dependent claims 9 and 10.

The First Office Action also rejected claims 2-4 and 6-8 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The amendments filed in Reply A included amendments intended to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

An Office Action dated April 14, 2004 (the "Final Office Action") finally rejected all pending claims in the present case. Specifically, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7-10 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over information entitled "Fairfield Ponte Vedra Decals and Access Cards," dated 1998, published on the Internet at the following address: www.digitaldatatechnology.com/fairfieldpontevedra/decals.html, ("Fairfield") in view of Official Notice. Claims 3 and 6 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fairfield in view of a 1998 news article from DeLaRue news centre, "De La Rue Gives Singapore the 'Midas Touch'" ("De La Rue").

The Final Office Action also maintained the former rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, despite the responsive amendments that had been submitted in Reply A. Appellant therefore initiated a telephone interview, which occurred on April 29, 2004. Examiner advised Appellant in the interview that the amendments of Reply A overcame the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, and that the rejections were officially withdrawn. The interview, including this conclusion by the Examiner, was documented in a written Interview Summary, filed by facsimile transmission on May 26, 2004.

Appellant has appealed from the final rejection. Notice of Appeal, mailed July 14, 2004, and received by USPTO on July 16, 2004.

Appl. No. 09/657,956
Filed 9/8/2000

Atty Docket JP920000170US1

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments were filed subsequent to those submitted in Reply A. The claims in the Claim Appendix herein set out the claims as amended in Reply A.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The present invention is claimed in the form of a method and apparatus in independent claims 1 and 5 respectively. According to the method form of the invention, generally stated, a non-valid pass is issued for an event and information about the pass is recorded in an accreditation system. Upon arrival of a holder of the pass at or near the event, the pass is validated, which includes updating accreditation status of the participant in the system and securing the pass in a security pouch. See claim 1. Thus, the validated pass advantageously has a new, readily recognizable form in comparison to the not-yet-valid version of the pass that is originally issued. That is, the validated pass is physically secured in a pouch. And further, once the pass is validated there is a record in the accreditation system that can be checked by an authority at the event so that the authority is not tricked into producing another valid-looking pass from a copy of the invalid pass. The apparatus form of the invention has similar limitations. See claim 5.

More specifically, claim 1, steps a) through e) are each a step plus function. Step plus function e) has two sub-steps, "updating an accreditation status of the participant in the accreditation system," and "securing the pass in a security pouch," each of which are also in step plus function form.

The method of claim 1 concerns accrediting participants to an event, and includes collecting information from each of the participants, which is recorded in an accreditation system. Present application, FIG. 1A (registration 220); FIG. 1C (recording 221); FIG. 3 (system 300); page 4, lines 18-22 (referring to Fig. 2 regarding the gathering of participant data through returned registration forms 320 that were previously sent to the participants in sub-step 215 and describing sub-steps of the registration step, including sub-step 221, according to which data of the participants is recorded into an accreditation database forming part of the accreditation system 300).

Appl. No. 09/657,956
Filed 9/8/2000

Atty Docket JP920000170US1

A non-valid pass is produced for each of the participants. FIG. 1A (230); page 5, line 14 through page 6, line 12. The respective non-valid passes are issued to the participants. Present application, FIG. 1A (235); page 6, line 14 through 21.

Upon arrival of such a participant at or proximate an event venue, the non-valid pass is validated for the participant, thereby accrediting said participant. This validating step includes updating an accreditation status of the participant in the accreditation system. It also includes securing the pass in a security pouch. Present application, page 6, line 28 – page 7, line 5 (“A non-valid accreditation pass is validated in step 250 by updating the accreditation status of the participant on the accreditation system 300, and laminating the accreditation pass into a security pouch. A validated accreditation pass serves as an identification and access control device to be worn by all participants. Therefore, the validated accreditation pass consists of a physical part, namely the accreditation pass itself once laminated, and a logical part being the participant’s accreditation status, which has been updated on the accreditation system 300.”).

Claim 5, has the following six means plus function forms: means for recording; producing means for producing a non-valid pass; issuing means for issuing the respective non-valid passes; validating means for validating said non-valid pass for such a participant; means for updating the accreditation status of the participant; and means for securing the pass.

More specifically, according to claim 5, an apparatus for accrediting participants to an event includes means for collecting information from each of said participants. See present application, page 4, lines 1-4 and lines 21-22 (describing application forms and web-site for information collection); FIG. 1B (215). The apparatus also includes means for recording the information in an accreditation system. See present application, page 4, lines 17-21 (describing a database for recording information); page 4, lines 28-30 (describing file 325 (FIG. 3) for recording information); FIG. 1C (221). Further, the apparatus includes producing means for producing a non-valid pass for each of said participants. See present application, FIG. 1A (230); page 5, lines 14-25 (describing producing non-valid passes by the accreditation computer system 300, which is further illustrated in FIG. 3). (A printer for such a computer system 300 is a well-known means for a function such as this).

Appl. No. 09/657,956
Filed 9/8/2000

Atty Docket JP920000170US1

The apparatus also includes issuing means for issuing the respective non-valid passes to said participants. See present application, FIG. 1A (235); page 5, line 26 - page 6, line 21 (describing physical delivery of the passes to participants and organizations - implying means such as postal service mail, courier, interoffice mail, personal delivery, etc.). The apparatus also includes validating means for validating said non-valid pass for such a participant upon the participant's arrival at, or proximate an event venue, thereby accrediting said participant, which includes accreditation system updating means and pass securing means. See present application, FIG. 1A (240); page 6, line 23 (describing updating status on the system 300, which implies an updating means such as a computer program for user interface to the database mentioned herein above, and describing laminating as a means of securing the passes).

According to claim 9, the non-valid passes that are issued to the participants form a first portion of a valid pass. The participants are associated with organisations. The non-valid passes are also produced by the accreditation system for the organisations. A non-valid organisation pass such as this forms a second portion of a valid pass. The non-valid passes are issued to the organisations, so that the organisations may distribute the second portions to selected ones of the participants associated with the respective organisations. The validating uses both the first and second portions of the pass. Present application, Page 3, lines 27 through 30 (describing association of participants with organizations); page 5, line 31 - page 6, line 15 ("A first part containing the participant's personal details is issued to each of these participants . . . A number of second parts are issued to the organisation, named a responsible organisation in this case. . . . The organisations apply for second part passes. The second part displays access privileges. . . . The responsible organisation is in charge of administering the distribution of the second part passes to the appropriate participants. This is typically done on a shift-by-shift basis and according to operational requirements. The two-part passes are only valid when both parts of the pass are used in conjunction with each other. In step 235 the non-valid accreditation passes, which also includes first parts of two-part passes, are issued to the participants. Second part passes are issued to responsible organisations.").

Appl. No. 09/657,956
Filed 9/8/2000

Atty Docket JP920000170US1

According to claim 10, the non-valid passes issued to the participants form a first portion of a valid pass and the participants are associated with organisations. The producing means is further for producing non-valid passes by the accreditation system for said organisations, wherein such a non-valid pass for an organisation forms a second portion of a valid pass. The issuing means is further for issuing the non-valid passes to said organisations, so that the organisations may distribute the second portions to selected ones of the participants associated with the respective organisations, wherein the validating means uses both the first and second portions of the pass. Present application, Page 5, line 31 – page 6, line 15 (“A first part containing the participant’s personal details is issued to each of these participants . . . A number of second parts are issued to the organisation, named a responsible organisation in this case. . . . The organisations apply for second part passes. The second part displays access privileges. . . . The responsible organisation is in charge of administering the distribution of the second part passes to the appropriate participants. This is typically done on a shift-by-shift basis and according to operational requirements. The two-part passes are only valid when both parts of the pass are used in conjunction with each other. In step 235 the non-valid accreditation passes, which also includes first parts of two-part passes, are issued to the participants. Second part passes are issued to responsible organisations.”).

GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fairfield in view of Official Notice.

ARGUMENT

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Fairfield in view of Official Notice

Claims 1-8. Solely for the purpose of this Appeal, claims 1 through 8 stand or fall together.

Claim 1. Appellant contends all the limitations of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by the prior art, and therefore the rejection is improper. MPEP 2143.03 (citing *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974); *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ

Appl. No. 09/657,956
Filed 9/8/2000

Atty Docket JP920000170US1

494, 496 (CCPA 1970)). Appellant also contends that it is improper to combine the teachings of the references that are relied upon for the rejection. The selected features taught by Fairfield that are relied upon in the rejection do not fit together in a logically consistent, workable fashion. See MPEP 2143.01 ("THE PROPOSED MODIFICATION CANNOT CHANGE THE PRINCIPLE OF OPERATION OF A REFERENCE If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious. *In re Ratti*, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959)"). And while it is a well-known practice to secure a security pass in a security pouch, e.g., a laminated badge, this mere fact of Official Notice does not suggest the combining of the step of issuing a non-valid pass to a participant for an event with the steps of validating the pass upon arrival of the participant at the event by securing the pass in a security pouch. See MPEP 2143.01 (citing *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990) and explaining that the mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination).

Fairfield has teachings about a resident decal (page 1, lines 9-17), a family decal (page 1, lines 18-26), an authorized guest list for permanent access (page 1, lines 29-32), a function guest list (page 2, lines 16-21), an access card (page 1, lines 33-42 and page 2, lines 5-12), a temporary pass for a new resident (page 1, line 43 - page 2, line 1), and a temporary pass for a person visiting up to seven days (page 2, lines 22-25). Fairfield teaches that each of these security instruments is processed in its own respective manner. For example, a *resident decal* is obtained by providing proof of ownership (presumably of the Fairfield residence) or proof of vehicle registration and a drivers license (presumably showing the address of the Fairfield residence on the drivers license). Fairfield, page 1, lines 6-8. A *family decal* is obtained by a resident identifying a family member and completing a Vehicle Registration Sheet. Fairfield, page 1, lines 19-21. A person with a family decal is permitted to enter a North gate at Fairfield "without questioning by the security guard." Id. A resident may obtain a magnetic *access card*, which permits the resident to pass through the North gate and a South gate. Fairfield, page 1, lines 33-42. A guest on the authorized guest list, however, is subjected to a

Appl. No. 09/657,956
Filed 9/8/2000

Atty Docket JP920000170US1

process of computer validation by the guard in order to obtain access. Fairfield, page 1, lines 29-32.

In addition to differences in processing of the various security instruments taught by Fairfield, there are differences in physical form. It is well known that a vehicle security decal is a picture or design glued to the holder's car on a windshield, visible for easy inspection. See for example, definition of "decal," The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 1979, Houghton Mifflin Company. This is consistent with Fairfield's explanation, since a person with a family decal is permitted to enter a North gate at Fairfield "without questioning by the security guard." Fairfield, page 1, lines 19-21. The authorized guest list described by Fairfield is data stored in a computer. Fairfield, page 1, lines 29-32. A magnetic access card is a well-known device that is scanned by an automatic, unattended controller, permitting one to pass through a security gate or door. Fairfield, page 1, lines 33-42.

Clearly, claim 1 in the present application focuses on a process regarding a "pass," which has a physical form, since it is ultimately secured in a security pouch. See present application, page 6, lines 14-15 (explaining that issuance of non-valid accreditation pass to participant) and page 6, line 31 - page 7, line 5 (explaining that validating includes laminating the previously issued, non-valid accreditation pass and that "the validated accreditation pass consists of a physical part, namely the accreditation pass itself once laminated, and a logical part being the participant's accreditation status, which has been updated on the accreditation system 300."). Claim 1 clearly refers to features and processes of the same pass in every one of the claim steps, with no reference to numerous different kinds of passes, such as the decals, guest lists and magnetic access cards of Fairfield. Once the pass of the present invention is processed so as to be valid, it advantageously has a readily recognizable form in comparison to the not-yet-valid version of the pass originally issued, since the validating includes securing the previously non-valid pass in a security pouch, such as by lamination.

The Final Office Action relies upon a selected combination of features from the different Fairfield security instruments to compare with different steps of claim 1 in the present application. The rejection relies on selected features of the Fairfield *resident decal* and its processes regarding steps a) and d) in claim 1 of the present application, the Fairfield *resident decal* and *permanent access guest list* and their processes regarding the claimed step

Appl. No. 09/657,956
Filed 9/8/2000

Atty Docket JP920000170US1

b), and the Fairfield *resident decal, family decal* and *permanent access guest list* and their processes regarding the claimed steps of c) and e). Also, in its concluding remarks the Final Office Action states that a feature of the Fairfield *access card* is relied upon with regard to claim step d).

The Final Office Action compares teaching about the Fairfield resident decal to claim 1, step a), of the present invention, an information collection step. However, Fairfield does not state that any information is collected in connection with the resident decal. Fairfield merely states that information regarding ownership or vehicle registration and drivers license is validated upon issuance of the decal. Fairfield, page 1, lines 10-12. The Final Office Action also compares teaching about the Fairfield resident decal to claim 1, step b), which states that the information collected in step a) is recorded in an accreditation system. But Fairfield does not state that in connection with issuance of a decal the identity of a resident or anything else is collected and entered into a system.

Fairfield *does* essentially say that information is collected in regard to a resident providing an Authorized Guest List for Vehicle Access form in connection with a permanent guest list, which the Final Office Action also compares to claim 1, step b). Fairfield further indicates the permanent guest list is validated in a computer system as a condition for a guest to enter a gate, which the Final Office Action compares to part of claim 1, step e). But Fairfield does not teach that a non-valid version of this permanent guest list is "issued to the guest," as claimed in step d). For this comparable feature, the Final Office Action relies upon the resident decal, which is a different matter than the permanent guest list.

Appellant has pointed out that the teaching of Fairfield about the resident decal does not teach, or even suggest, that the decal is non-valid when issued. In response to this point, the Final Office Action refers to a "notion of issuing of passes . . . cited above," and refers to teaching by Fairfield about validating the passes at the gate/terminal. But it is the *permanent guest list* that Fairfield teaches is validated in the guard's computer system when a guest arrives at the guarded North Fairfield gate. Thus, the Final Office Action has, once again, switched its reliance from one matter to another. Further, Fairfield does not teach that a non-valid guest list is issued to the guest as a pass.

Appl. No. 09/657,956
Filed 9/3/2000

Atty Docket JP920000170US1

In its concluding remarks, the Final Office Action confusingly refers to a *Fairfield access card*, with regard to the claimed step of issuing an invalid pass to a participant. That is, the assertion is made that because *Fairfield* teaches an access card may be invalidated if misused, this somehow suggests issuance of an non-valid pass to a participant. However, this simply does not follow. The *Fairfield* access card that is issued must be valid or it would not function to enable the automatic gate, as taught. It is only upon misuse that the card is made non-valid. This invalidation is not upon issuance, it is upon revocation.

To summarize, what *Fairfield* teaches about the features relied upon for the rejection is the following:

- information is collected from a resident for identifying a guest on a guest list;
- a decal is issued for the vehicle of a resident or resident's family member so the vehicle can pass through a gate without questioning by a guard;
- a valid magnetic access card is issued to a resident so the resident's vehicle can pass through automatically through a gate;
- the access card is invalidated if the card is misused; and
- the guest list is validated in a computer system by a guard when the identified guest wants to enter a gate. This does not teach or suggest issuing a non-valid pass to a participant for an event, recording information about the pass in an accreditation system and validating the pass upon arrival of the participant at the event, including updating accreditation status of the participant in the system, as claimed in the present case.

Further, the features taught by *Fairfield* that are relied upon for the rejection concern physically disparate security instruments that are processed in respectively different ways. The features concerning the decal, guest list and access card for the *Fairfield* facility do not fit together in a coherent, workable fashion to provide the claimed steps concerning a pass issued to a participant for an event. For example, since a *Fairfield* decal is issued so that a resident or family member can pass through a gate without questioning by a guard, this is not consistent with a guard validating a list in a computer system as a condition of entry for the resident or family member.

In addition to the above, the Final Office Action relies upon Official Notice to supply a teaching corresponding to one of the claim steps, that the validating of the non-valid pass

Appl. No. 09/657,956
Filed 9/8/2000

Atty Docket JP920000170US1

includes securing the pass in a security pouch. The specification of the present application describes laminating as one way to do this. Present application, page 6, lines 28-30. Appellant agrees that it is well-known to secure a pass in this manner. However, the mere fact that it is known to secure a pass in a security pouch, does not, either alone or in combination with the teachings of Fairfield, suggest that non-valid decals, guest lists or access cards are issued to residents or family members so that the non-valid decals, guest lists or access cards can be validated by securing them in a security pouch upon a resident or family member arriving at Fairfield. Appellant contends that the claimed arrangement is counterintuitive and contrary to the well-known arrangement in which an identification badge is prepared in advance of a conference or similar event so that a participant can pick up the badge upon arrival. See present application, page 1, lines 10-31 (describing the conventional scenario).

Claims 2 through 4. Claims 2-4 are allowable at least because they depend on claim 1. MPEP 2143.03 ("If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious," citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)).

Claim 5. Claim 5 sets out an apparatus form of the invention and has limitations like those of claim 1, but according to its particular form. Appellant contends claim 5 is allowable for reasons stated above regarding claim 1.

Claims 6 through 8. Claims 6-8 are allowable at least because they depend on claim 5. *Id.*

Claims 9 and 10. Solely for the purpose of this Appeal, claims 9 and 10 stand or fall together.

Claim 9. Appellant contends all the limitations of claim 9 are not taught or suggested by the prior art, and therefore the rejection is improper. MPEP 2143.03 (citing *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974); *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970)). Appellant also contends that it is improper to combine the teachings of the references that are relied upon for the rejection. The selected features taught by Fairfield that are relied upon in the rejection do not fit together in a logically consistent, workable fashion. See MPEP 2143.01 ("THE PROPOSED MODIFICATION CANNOT

Appl. No. 09/657,956
Filed 9/8/2000

Atty Docket JP920000170US1

CHANGE THE PRINCIPLE OF OPERATION OF A REFERENCE If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious. *In re Ratti*, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959").

Dependent claim 9 sets out aspects of the claimed method according to which the non-valid pass that is issued to the participant in the event forms a first portion of a valid pass, the participant is associated with an organization, and a second, non-valid pass portion is produced and issued to the organization, which then distributes the second portion to the participant so that it can be used to form a second portion of the valid pass in the validating step. The Final Office Action relies on the Fairfield decal described above as teaching the claimed step about the first non-valid portion of the pass. As explained herein above, however, there is no teaching or suggestion by Fairfield, or Fairfield combined with the stated Official Notice, that non-valid decals are issued to residents or family members so that the non-valid decals can be validated by securing them in a security pouch upon a resident or family member arriving at Fairfield.

Regarding the claim features about the participant being associated with an organization, and a second, non-valid pass portion being produced and issued to the organization, which then distributes the second portion to the participant so that it can be used to form a second portion of the valid pass in the validating step, the Final Office Action refers to passages in Fairfield about the decal, the permanent guest list and the access card described above and also about a temporary visitor pass issued at the direction of a resident. The Final Office Action refers also to a Realtor exception, under which entry may be allowed without resident authorization. The Final Office Action does not explain how these matters taught by Fairfield teach or suggest the claimed features. Appellant contends they do not teach or suggest the claimed features. Appellant recognizes that a Realtor is associated with an organization such as a real estate brokerage firm, but in the Fairfield reference there is no teaching or suggestion that a Fairfield pass is issued to a real estate brokerage firm for distribution by the brokerage firm to a Realtor. And there is certainly no suggestion that

Appl. No. 09/657,956
Filed 9/8/2000

Atty Docket JP920000170US1

separate, non-valid pass portions issued respectively to a Realtor and the Realtor's brokerage firm are used to form a single valid pass.

Claim 10 sets out an apparatus form of the invention and has limitations like those of claim 9, but according to its particular form. Appellant contends claim 10 is allowable for reasons stated above regarding claim 9.

REQUEST FOR ACTION

Based on the above arguments, Appellant requests that claims 1 through 9 of present application be allowed and the application promptly passed to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

By Anthony V.S. England
Anthony V.S. England
Registration No. 35,129
Attorney of Record for
IBM Corporation
1717 West Sixth Street, Suite 230
Austin, Texas 78703
Telephone: 512-477-7165
a@aengland.com

Attachment: Claims Appendix

Docket JP920000170US1

Appl. No.: 09/657,956
Filed: September 8, 2000CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. (previously presented) A method of accrediting participants to an event, said method comprising the steps of:
 - a) collecting information from each of said participants;
 - b) recording the information in an accreditation system;
 - c) producing a non-valid pass for each of said participants;
 - d) issuing the respective non-valid passes to said participants; and
 - e) upon arrival of such a participant at, or proximate an event venue, validating said non-valid pass for the participant, thereby accrediting said participant, wherein step e) includes the steps of:
 updating an accreditation status of the participant in the accreditation system; and
 securing the pass in a security pouch.
2. (previously presented) The method of claim 1, comprising the further step of:
 upon arrival of such a participant, verifying information of said participant before said non-valid pass is validated.
3. (previously presented) The method of claim 1, comprising the further steps of:
 for foreign participants and before arrival of participants, sending a bulk visa request to an Immigration Authority; and
 receiving a visa status from said Immigration Authority, allowing said validated pass to serve as a visa.
4. (previously presented) The method of claim 1, comprising the further steps of:
 ascribing an accreditation class to each of said participants; and
 ascribing privileges to each of said accreditation classes.

Docket JP920000170US1

Appl. No.: 09/657,956
Filed: September 8, 2000CLAIMS APPENDIX

5. (previously presented) Apparatus for accrediting participants to an event, said apparatus comprising:

means for collecting information from each of said participants;
means for recording the information in an accreditation system;
producing means for producing a non-valid pass for each of said participants;
issuing means for issuing the respective non-valid passes to said participants; and
validating means for validating said non-valid pass for such a participant upon the participant's arrival at, or proximate an event venue, thereby accrediting said participant, wherein the validating means includes:

means for updating the accreditation status of the participant in the accreditation system; and

means for securing the pass in a security pouch.

6. (previously presented) The apparatus of claim 5, further comprising:

for foreign participants and before arrival of said participants, means for sending a bulk visa request to an Immigration Authority; and

means for receiving a visa status from said Immigration Authority, allowing said validated pass to serve as a visa.

7. (previously presented) The apparatus of claim 5, further comprising:

means for ascribing an accreditation class to each of said participants; and
means for ascribing privileges to each of said accreditation classes.

8. (previously presented) The apparatus of claim 5, wherein said apparatus is a distributed system comprising interconnected servers and workstations.

Docket JP920000170US1

Appl. No.: 09/657,956
Filed: September 8, 2000CLAIMS APPENDIX

9. (previously presented) The method of claim 1, wherein the non-valid passes issued to the participants form a first portion of a valid pass and the participants are associated with organisations, and wherein the method comprises the steps of:

producing non-valid passes by the accreditation system for said organisations, wherein such a non-valid pass for an organisation forms a second portion of a valid pass; and

issuing the non-valid passes to said organisations, so that the organisations may distribute the second portions to selected ones of the participants associated with the respective organisations, wherein the validating in step e) uses both the first and second portions of the pass.

10. (previously presented) The apparatus of claim 5, wherein the non-valid passes issued to the participants form a first portion of a valid pass and the participants are associated with organisations;

wherein the producing means is further for producing non-valid passes by the accreditation system for said organisations, wherein such a non-valid pass for an organisation forms a second portion of a valid pass; and

wherein the issuing means is further for issuing the non-valid passes to said organisations, so that the organisations may distribute the second portions to selected ones of the participants associated with the respective organisations, wherein the validating means uses both the first and second portions of the pass.